Erasing the path information stored by a qudit in a symmetric Mach-Zehnder interferometer

Soroush Khademi* and Ali Reza Bahrampour†

Department of Physics, Sharif University of Technology,

P.O. Box 11155-9161, Tehran, Iran.

arXiv:1602.04803v1 [quant-ph] 15 Feb 2016

Abstract

In an interferometer, no interference happens if the quanta's path information is available in an ancillary system. One can erase this information by an appropriate measurement and recognize subensembles of the interferometry data showing interference. We consider symmetric Mach-Zehnder or Michelson interferometers in which a qudit, initially prepared in a pure state, provides the path information. We set measures of which-path information and which-phase information (knowledge about the phase difference between the interferometer's arms) by use of Shannon entropy and show that by erasing the which-path information, one can obtain the same amount of which-phase information. As an example, we propose a new modified Michelson interferometer, feasible by today's technology, in which a qubit (an atom trapped in a cavity) gathers the photon's path information. Erasing is done by measuring the atom's energy.

Keywords: wave-particle duality, quantum erasure, qudit, Shannon entropy, interferometer

1. INTRODUCTION

Bohr's complementarity principle is a cornerstone of Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics [1–3]. According to wave-particle complementarity, the result of any interferometric experiment done with a single quanta sounds as if the quanta has passed through several paths like a classical wave (e.g., the interference pattern forms) or as if it has passed through just one path like a classical particle (one special path can be attributed to the quanta); so the experimenter is able to describe the results of such an experiment by use of classical pictures of propagation (wavelike propagation or particle-like propagation) in a complementary (and not contradictory) way [4]. A single quanta showing wavelike behavior in an experiment may exhibit particle-like behavior in another experiment if the setups of the two experiments are mutually exclusive[2]. This principle has been verified in many experiments (see, e.g., [5, 6]).

But path attribution is not essential for disappearance of the interference pattern; even if the experimenter has merely a potential ability to attribute a special path to the quanta, the interference vanishes[7, 8]. For example, when state $|p_i\rangle$ corresponding to the quanta's path in a two-path interferometer maximally entangles with state $|q_i\rangle$ of another physical system, such potential ability forms. In other words, obtaining which-path information becomes possible. The experimenter is able to measure the ancillary system in the basis $\{|q_1\rangle, |q_2\rangle\}$ and ascribe a special path to the quanta according to the result of the measurement. There is also another interesting choice of the measurement basis; the experimenter can destroy the possibility of path attribution by measuring the ancillary system in basis $\{|\bar{q_1}\rangle, |\bar{q_2}\rangle\}$ which is unbiased to the basis $\{|q_1\rangle, |q_2\rangle\}$. The destruction of this possibility lets the experimenter see the wavelike behavior of the quanta. It is enough to sort the output data of the interferometry accorrding to the results of such a measurement; each subensemble of the output data shows interference. This procedure is called quantum erasing [7, 8] beacuase the (potential) path information is erased. Erasing can be done in various interferometers (see, for example, [9, 10]).

An arbitrary interaction between the quanta and the ancillary system may lead to an entangled state which is not maximal. In this case, the visibility of the interference decreases. Visibility is defined as

$$V = \frac{P_{max} - P_{min}}{P_{max} + P_{min}} \tag{1}$$

Where P is the probability of detecting the quanta by a detector and the maximization and minimization are against the phase difference between the arms of the interferometer. Many attempts have been made to model this case from wave-particle complementarity's point of view. To achieve this goal, wavelike behavior and particle-like behavior should be quantified. In a symmetric two-path interferometer, visibility is considered to be a measure of wavelike behavior and a quantity called distinguishability is defined as a measure of particle-like behavior:

$$D = -1 + 2L \tag{2}$$

where L is the average winning chance in a guessing game and differs from 0.5 to 1 – so D differs from 0 to 1. In this game (which will be called *path guessing game*), one of the paths of the interferometer is randomly omitted and the experimenter should guess which one has survived with the help of an appropriate measurement on the ancillary system. It has been shown [11] that

$$D^2 + V^2 \leq 1 \tag{3}$$

This relationship shows the trade-off between wavelike behavior and particle-like behavior expected by wave-particle complementarity. We should keep in mind that although D has been calculated in a guessing game (with modifications in the setup of interferometry), it is recognized as a characteristic of the interferometer itself.

When the ancillary system is initially prepared in a pure state, equality holds in (3). In this case, quantum erasing introduces subensembles of the output data which show interference with visibility one [12]. That is to say, in this case, we can re-write (3) as

$$V^2_{erasure\ subensembles} - V^2 = D^2 \tag{4}$$

Equation (4) is re-expressing the quantum erasing procedure. It indicates that the amount of squared visibility the experimenter can gain by erasing equals the squared distinguishability (which will be sacrificed in the procedure).

Inequality (3) is also valid in an asymmetric two-path interferometer if one modifies the guessing game properly. [12] derives an erasure relation setting an upper bound on the visibility of the erasure subensembles for the general case of two-path interferometers.

Wavelike and particle-like behavior can be quantified by measures different from visibility and distinguishability. To have a different measure of wavelike behavior, we consider a game introduced in [13]. In this game (which will be called *phase guessing game*), one of the two phases $\{\phi_0, \phi_0 + \pi\}$ is randomly applied to a two-path interferometer – ϕ_0 is determined by the particular interferometry setup – and the experimenter should guess which value has been chosen. While the experimenter's ability to win the game (to discover the applied phase) is a measure of wavelike behavior, we use the Shannon entropy of the probabilistic guess as a measure of *lack* of wavelike behavior. We also use the Shannon entropy of the experimenter's probabilistic guess in the path guessing game as a measure of *lack* of particle-like behavior.

The idea of using entropic measures was first proposed by [14] in 1979. Although such measures were later used by others (for example [15–17]), the idea has had its own critics [18, 19]. In 2014, [13] derived a basic wave-particle duality relation by use of entropic measures and the guessing games. It showed the equivalence of wave-particle complementarity to entropic uncertainty.

In section (2), we derive a relationship like equation (4) between the Shannon entropies for a special category of interferometers which re-expresses the quantum erasing procedure. The concept of information is usually used to describe quantum erasure, but expressing this phenomena by a standard measure of information clearly confirms that information is playing a role. A new interferometric setup is proposed in section (3) as an example of the interferometers of the category. This setup can be implemented by today's technology. We will survey how the relationship that we derive works in the proposed interferometer in section (4).

2. ERASING THE PATH INFORMATION

Figure (1) shows a symmetric Mach-Zehnder interferometer. A single quanta enters the interferometer – we show the quanta's state corresponding to the upper route with $|u\rangle$ and the state corresponding to the lower one with $|l\rangle$. In the lower arm, the quanta experiences the phase shift ϕ and arbitrarily interacts with another system. We consider only the



FIG. 1. A single quanta enters a Mach-Zehnder interferometer. Both beamsplitters (BS_1 and BS_2) are symmetric. In the lower arm, the quanta experiences a phase shift (ϕ) and interacts with another system (Q). The time before it passes through the second beamsplitter is shown by t_1. Finally, D_1 or D_2 detects the quanta.

situation that this ancillary system is initially prepared in a pure state.

First, an ancillary system with just two levels is discussed. The results will be generalized to d-level systems at the end of this section. The initial state is shown by $|0\rangle$ – orthogonal states $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ spans the relevant subspace. Before the quanta passes through the second beamsplitter (BS_2), we have

$$|\psi(t_1)\rangle_{system} = \frac{|u\rangle \otimes |0\rangle + e^{i\phi}e^{i\gamma}|l\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \tag{5}$$

where

$$|\phi\rangle = cos(\frac{\alpha}{2})|0\rangle + e^{i\beta}sin(\frac{\alpha}{2})|1\rangle \tag{6}$$

State $|\phi\rangle$ is independent of parameter ϕ. α, β and γ are determined by the form of the interaction – while α and γ are free to change from 0 to π and from 0 to 2π, respectively, we temporarily consider only the interactions for which $\beta = \frac{3\pi}{2}$. Finally, the quanta passes through BS_2 and is detected by D_1 or D_2. After these explanations, it is time to play the guessing games and derive the desired relationship.

In the path guessing game, one of the paths should be randomly omitted – so the first beamsplitter (BS_1) is randomly removed or replaced with a perfect reflector. In other words,

there is a random variable $\mathcal{P} = \{$ the upper path is blocked, the lower path is blocked $\}$ with maximum entropy $H(\mathcal{P}) = 1$. We should guess which path has been blocked each time. We know that if BS_1 has been removed,

$$|\psi(t_1)\rangle_{system} = |u\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \tag{7}$$

otherwise,

$$|\psi(t_1)\rangle_{system} = e^{i\phi}e^{i\gamma}|l\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle \tag{8}$$

Clearly, to know which detector clicks does not help us. We should perform a measurement on the ancillary system. If $|0\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$ were distinguishable, our guess was exact; but as they are generally indistinguishable, our guess is probabilistic with an entropy. We consider that just projective measurements are allowed – so the result is a two-state random variable shown by $\mathcal{M}$. The basis for the measurement which minimizes the conditional Shannon entropy $H(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{M})$ is desired. Our calculations confirm that this basis is symmetric to $|0\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$ as shown in figure (2) (see [20] for a proof). It consists of

$$|s_1\rangle = cos(\frac{\pi+\alpha}{4})|0\rangle - isin(\frac{\pi+\alpha}{4})|1\rangle, |s_2\rangle = cos(\frac{\pi-\alpha}{4})|0\rangle + isin(\frac{\pi-\alpha}{4})|1\rangle \tag{9}$$

The entropy obtained by this measurement is shown by $H(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{M}_s)$ – this basis is just the one used for calculating distinguishability D [11]. Just like D, we recognize $H(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{M}_s)$ as a characteristic of the interferometer itself. It shows the lack of the quanta's particle-like behavior in this setup. The quantity $H(\mathcal{P}) - H(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{M}_s) = I(\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{M}_s)$ (mutual information between $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{M}_s$) is a measure of particle-like behavior. So we use a standard measure of information to measure the so-called which-path information.

The next game is phase guessing. One of the two values of random variable $\Phi = \{\phi_0, \phi_0 + \pi\}$ is randomly applied to the interferometer as the phase difference and we should guess which value has been chosen. In this game, knowing which detector clicks helps us to win the game; but generally, our guess will be still probabilistic and has the entropy $H(\Phi|\mathcal{D})$. $\mathcal{D}$ is another random variable defined as $\mathcal{D} = \{D_1$ clicks, D_2 clicks$\}$.

Additionally, we can use the ancillary system to have a better guess. We are curious that how much measuring the ancillary system in a basis unbiased to $\{|s_1\rangle, |s_2\rangle\}$ (sacrificing our



FIG. 2. Two qubit states $|0\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$ are shown in a Bloch sphere. Basis $\{|s_1\rangle, |s_2\rangle\}$ is symmetric to these two vector states and is used to discriminate between them. Bases unbiased to $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ form the solid ring on the Bloch sphere. Bases unbiased to $\{|s_1\rangle, |s_2\rangle\}$ form the dashed ring on the Bloch sphere and can be used for erasing.

ability of path attribution) helps us to decrease the phase entropy. In other words, we want to know that how much quantum erasing helps us to find the value of the applied phase. The bases unbiased to $\{|s_1\rangle, |s_2\rangle\}$ forms a ring on the surface of the Bloch sphere (the dashed ring in figure (2)). We show these bases with $\{|e_+\rangle, |e_-\rangle\}$. To find them, it is enough to rotate the ring of unbiased bases to $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ which have the form $\{\frac{|0\rangle \pm e^{i\chi}|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}\}$ - χ differs from 0 to π (the solid ring in figure (2)). As we are temporarily limited to $\beta = \frac{3\pi}{2}$, this rotation is about x axis. Its angle equals $\frac{\alpha-\pi}{2}$. We denote the rotation operator by $R_x(-\frac{\pi-\alpha}{2})$. So

$$
\begin{aligned}
|e_\pm\rangle \;=\; & R_x(-\tfrac{\pi-\alpha}{2})\tfrac{|0\rangle \pm e^{i\chi}|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} = \\
& \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(cos(-\tfrac{\pi-\alpha}{4}) \mp ie^{i\chi}sin(-\tfrac{\pi-\alpha}{4}))\,|0\rangle + \\
& \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-isin(-\tfrac{\pi-\alpha}{4}) \pm e^{i\chi}cos(-\tfrac{\pi-\alpha}{4}))\,|1\rangle
\end{aligned}
\tag{10}
$$

Each erasing basis is characterized by χ. The result of a measurement in one of these bases is a two-state random variable shown by $\mathcal{M}_e$. By considering this result, we can have a better guess with entropy $H(\Phi|\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M}_e)$. The non-negative quantity $E = H(\Phi|\mathcal{D}) - H(\Phi|\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M}_e)$

shows how much quantum erasing has helped us to sense the phase. It is the amount of wavelike behavior which has been exhibited by doing quantum erasing. By analogy with the concept *which-path information*, E is the amount of *which-phase information* which we gain by erasing.

To re-express the quantum erasing procedure, similar to equation (4), we search for a relationship between E and $I(\mathcal{P}:\mathcal{M}_s)$.

Although the value of E depends on ϕ_0 and χ, our calculations show that the average of E over ϕ_0 does not depend on χ. For example, for an interaction with parameters $\beta = \frac{3\pi}{2}$ and $\alpha = \frac{3\pi}{4}$ (and $\gamma = \frac{\pi}{2}$), we have

$$\bar{E} = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^{\pi} E(\phi_0,\chi)d\phi_0 \approx 0.389 \tag{11}$$

This interesting result indicates that this measure can reflect (in the average form) the insignificance of the specific basis used for quantum erasing; all matters is that the basis should be unbiased to $\{|s_1\rangle, |s_2\rangle\}$. We could not, after all, find a meaningful relationship between $\bar{E}$ and $I(\mathcal{P}:\mathcal{M}_s)$. But other ways exist to attack the problem.

We consider that the phase guessing game is played for $\tilde{\phi_0}$ which maximizes $H(\Phi|\mathcal{D})$. Figure (3) shows that $H(\tilde{\Phi}|\mathcal{D})$ where $\tilde{\Phi} = \{\tilde{\phi_0}, \tilde{\phi_0}+\pi\}$ equals one for any value of $\alpha - \gamma$ only plays role in determining $\tilde{\phi_0}$. So we do erasing for a situation it is most needful. We naturally choose an erasing basis which helps more (which minimizes $H(\tilde{\Phi}|\mathcal{D},\mathcal{M}_e)$). Our calculations show that

$$\min_{\chi} H(\tilde{\Phi}|\mathcal{D},\mathcal{M}_e) = H(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{M}_s) \tag{12}$$

While $\beta = \frac{3\pi}{2}$ and the only role played by parameter γ is in the determination of $\tilde{\phi_0}$ (equation (5)), figure (3) shows equation (12) for an arbitrary value of α. But it is not the desired relationship; to achieve our goal, we should re-write it as

$$1 - \min_{\chi} H(\tilde{\Phi}|\mathcal{D},\mathcal{M}_e) = 1 - H(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{M}_s) \tag{13}$$

because $H(\tilde{\Phi}|\mathcal{D}) = 1$ and $H(\mathcal{P}) = 1$, we have

$$H(\tilde{\Phi}|\mathcal{D}) - \min_{\chi} H(\tilde{\Phi}|\mathcal{D},\mathcal{M}_e) = H(\mathcal{P}) - H(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{M}_s) \tag{14}$$

so



FIG. 3. (Color figure) The conditional entropy of phase $H(\tilde{\Phi}|\mathcal{D})$ equals one for any value of α. Additionally, the minimum (over χ, the erasing bases) of the conditional entropy of phase $H(\tilde{\Phi}|\mathcal{D},\mathcal{M}_e)$ equals the conditional entropy of path $H(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{M}_s)$ for any value of α.

$$\max_{\chi}\{H(\tilde{\Phi}|\mathcal{D}) - H(\tilde{\Phi}|\mathcal{D},\mathcal{M}_e)\} = I(\mathcal{P}:\mathcal{M}_s) \tag{15}$$

Equation (15) indicates that the amount of wavelike behavior which can be exhibited by quantum erasing equals the amount of particle-like behavior (which will be sacrificed in the procedure). In other words, it indicates that the amount of which-phase information obtainable by quantum erasing equals the which-path information that is erased.

Now, it is time to get rid of the restriction $\beta = \frac{3\pi}{2}$. To find an arbitrary β, it is enough to rotate the Bloch sphere about z axis sufficiently. So the rotational invariance of the system can guarantee the validity of equation (15) for arbitrary values of parameters α, β and γ (an arbitrary interaction).

Equation (15) holds for situations different from the one shown by figure (1). If the two-level system Q interacts with the quanta in both arms, we can set the Bloch sphere such that

$$U(|u\rangle \otimes |\phi_0\rangle) = e^{i\zeta}|u\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \ , \ U(|l\rangle \otimes |\phi_0\rangle) = e^{i\zeta}e^{i\gamma}|l\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle \tag{16}$$

where $|\phi_0\rangle$ is the initial state of Q. Then, up to the global phase ζ, every thing can proceed like the case of figure (1). Additionally, the entanglement between the quanta's path and a two-level system may be made by a mechanism different from an interaction inside the interferometer.

For a d-level ancillary system, we write:

$$U(|u\rangle \otimes |\phi_0\rangle) = |u\rangle \otimes |\phi_1\rangle \ , \ U(|l\rangle \otimes |\phi_0\rangle) = |l\rangle \otimes |\phi_2\rangle \tag{17}$$

where $|\phi_0\rangle$ is the initial state of the system. About the validity of equation (15) for this situation, one may concern over the optimum projective measurement used in the path guessing game (the projective measurement can have d possible outcomes) and consequently, the erasing measurement in the phase guessing game. In the first game, we should discriminate between two pure states $|\phi_1\rangle$ and $|\phi_2\rangle$ prepared randomly. [20] has introduced the characteristics of the projective measurement basis $\{|s_1\rangle, |s_2\rangle, |s_3\rangle, ..., |s_d\rangle\}$ which maximizes $I(\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{M})$ (minimizes $H(\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{M})$) – here, $\mathcal{M}$ can be a d-state random variable. First, "two basis vectors (say $|s_1\rangle$ and $|s_2\rangle$) lie in the plane spanned by the state vectors $|\phi_1\rangle$ and $|\phi_2\rangle$" and just these two outcomes are possible. Second, $|s_1\rangle$ and $|s_2\rangle$ are symmetric to $|\phi_1\rangle$ and $|\phi_2\rangle$. So everything can proceed like before and equation (15) is still valid. Specially, $\{|e_+\rangle, |e_-\rangle, |s_3\rangle, |s_4\rangle, |s_5\rangle, ..., |s_d\rangle\}$ is the erasing basis.

Section (3) introduces an interferometer which has the criteria of equation (15).

3. PROPOSING A NEW INTERFEROMETRY SETUP

We propose a modified Michelson interferometer. It is depicted in figure (4). It is an example of the setups for which we derived equation (15). A single photon enters the interferometer through a 50:50 beamsplitter. It interacts with another system in the horizontal arm and is finally reflected. An adjustable phase shifter exerts a total phase shift ϕ during the photon's travel in this arm. We should keep in mind that the optical path length of the two arms have been equalized before inserting the phase shifter – for example, the actual length of the vertical arm equals the optical path length of the horizontal one. Eventually, D_1 or D_2 detects the photon.



FIG. 4. A modified Michelson interferometer. One arm of the interferometer is equipped by a cavity and an atom to track the single photon. The beamsplitter (BS) is symmetric and the final phase difference between the arms of the interferometer equals ϕ. At end, the single photon is detected by D_1 or D_2. The optical circulator used to guide the reflected photon toward D_1 can be replaced by a switch. Even if one removes the optical circulator and D_1 completely, nothing happens; just the random variable $\mathcal{D}$ should be defined as $\{D_2$ does not click, D_2 clicks$\}$.

In order to describe the ancillary system, first, we consider an atom with three levels $\{|g_0\rangle, |g_1\rangle, |e\rangle\}$ trapped in a cavity. The transition frequency between $|g_1\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$ equals the resonance frequency of the cavity and the transition frequency between $|g_0\rangle$ and $|g_1\rangle$ or $|e\rangle$ is far from f_0. When the atom's state is in the subspace spanned by $|g_1\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$, strong coupling between the atom and the cavity leads to mode splitting. That is to say, the system finds entangled energy levels. The transition frequency between these new levels is different from f_0. Now, we make one of the cavity's reflectors (e.g., the left one) have a little leakage and let the system interact with a single photon coming from the left side (figure (5)). What happens depends on the atom's initial state and the photon's frequency.

To be accurate, we use the equation derived for this system by [21] in the input-output formulation:

$$\hat{a}_{out} = \frac{i\Delta - \kappa/2}{i\Delta + \kappa/2}\,\hat{a}_{in} \tag{18}$$



FIG. 5. An atom with three relevant energy levels is trapped in a Fabry-Perot cavity whose left mirror has a small leakage. Just transition frequency between $|g_1\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$ is near the resonance frequency of the cavity. A single photon comes from left. What happens depends on the initial state of the atom and the frequency of the photon. After all, it will be reflected.

κ is the cavity decay rate and

$$\Delta = 2\pi(f - f_0) \tag{19}$$

f_0 is the frequency of the single photon. f is the resonance frequency of the system which the photon faces. If the atom is initially prepared in $|g_0\rangle$, it is not coupled with the cavity; the photon faces just the cavity and f is the cavity's resonance frequency. If the atom is initially prepared in the subspace spanned by $|g_1\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$, it is strongly coupled with the cavity; f equals the transition frequency between the entangled levels of the atom and the cavity.

We are curious about the situation in which f_0 is close to the resonance frequency of the cavity. When the atom is prepared in $|g_0\rangle$, Δ is comparable with κ and the photon experience an η phase shift by being reflected. But when the atom is prepared in the subspace spanned by $|g_1\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$, $\Delta \gg \kappa$ and the photon does not experience a phase shift after being reflected.

We put this system (as a qubit) in a Michelson interferometer as shown in figure (4). The atom is prepared in $|u_+\rangle = \frac{|g_1\rangle+|g_0\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$. The single photon is sent. Just before it enters the beamsplitter for the second time, we have

$$|\psi(t_1)\rangle_{system} = \frac{|v\rangle \otimes |u_+\rangle + e^{i\phi}|h\rangle \otimes |u\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \tag{20}$$

where $|v\rangle$ and $|h\rangle$ show the photon's state correspond to the vertical and horizontal path respectively and

$$|u\rangle = \frac{|g_1\rangle + e^{i\eta}|g_0\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \tag{21}$$

η can differ from 0 to π. Finally, D_1 or D_2 detects the photon. Due to the existence of partial which-path information, the visibility of the interference decreases. The experimenter is able to perform a measurement on the atom in an appropriate basis and attribute a path to each photon probabilistically. Relation (3) is obeyed here. Now, if f_0 equals the cavity's resonance frequency, $\eta = \pi$ and so $|u\rangle = |u_-\rangle = \frac{|g_1\rangle - |g_0\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$. $|u_-\rangle$ is orthogonal to $|u_+\rangle$; so these two states are distinguishable. Complete which-path information exists in this extreme case and prohibits the interference.

This interferometric setup, specially for the extreme case, can be implemented by today's technology. [22] has implemented the system of atom and cavity to nondestructively detect single photons (with a central frequency which equals the cavity's resonance frequency).

In the next section, we survey the quantum erasing procedure for this interferometer.

4. ERASING THE PATH INFORMATION IN THE PROPOSED SETUP

By considering $|u_+\rangle = |0\rangle$ and $|u_-\rangle = |1\rangle$, all the erasing procedure is the same as explained in section (2). Specially, In order to check equation (15), we write $|u\rangle$ in the basis $\{|u_+\rangle, |u_-\rangle\}$:

$$|u\rangle = e^{i\frac{\eta}{2}} \left(cos(\frac{\eta}{2}) \, |u_+\rangle - isin(\frac{\eta}{2}) \, |u_-\rangle\right) \tag{22}$$

By comparing (20) and (22) with (5) and (6), it is clear that

$$\alpha = \eta \ , \ \beta = \frac{3\pi}{2} \ and \ \gamma = \frac{\eta}{2} \tag{23}$$

So, based on figure (3), the equation holds in this setup. Our calculations show that $\tilde{\phi}_0 = \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{\eta}{2}$ and the erasing basis which minimizes $H(\tilde{\Phi}|\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M}_e)$ is $\{|g_0\rangle, |g_1\rangle\}$ for any value of η. So, interestingly, quantum erasing can be done for any value of η by measuring the atom's energy. This measurement is experimentally efficient.

5. CONCLUSION

In this article, we derived a relationship which re-expresses the quantum erasing procedure in a special category of two-path interferometers. This category consists of symmetric Mach-Zehnder or Michelson interferometers in which a qudit, initially prepared in a pure state, stores the path information. The experimenter plays two guessing games. By using the Shannon entropy of the experimenter's guess in these games, the amount of particle-like behavior (which-path information) and the amount of wavelike behavior (which-phase information) exhibited by erasing are determined. The relationship shows that the amount of wavelike behavior observable by erasing equals the amount of particle-like behavior which is completely lost in the procedure.

Then, as an example, we proposed a new interferometry setup. It is a symmetric Michelson interferometer in which a system of atom and cavity tracks the single photon. The system plays the role of a qubit gathering the path information. This interferometer can be built by today's technology.

At end, we showed how the relationship that we have found works in the proposed interferometer. The experimenter can do erasing by measuring the atom's energy.

The relationship that we have derived is probably valid for all symmetric two-path interferometers. In the case of asymmetry, the equation probably holds by modifying the guessing games.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Soroush Khademi would like to thank Vahid Karimipour for his important guidance about the mathematical relation which has been found.

---

* soroush@physics.sharif.ir

† bahrampour@sharif.edu

[1] H. Kragh, Quantum generations: A history of physics in the twentieth century, Princeton University Press, 2002.

[2] B. Falkenburg, Particle metaphysics: A critical account of subatomic reality, Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.

[3] K. A. Peacock, The quantum revolution: A historical perspective, Greenwood Publishing Group, 2008.

[4] D. Home, Conceptual foundations of quantum mechanicsan overview from modern perspectives (1997).

[5] R. Feynmann, R. Leighton, M. Sands, The feynman lectures on physics, 3 volumes (1970).

[6] P. Bogár, J. A. Bergou, Entanglement of atomic beams: Tests of complementarity and other applications, Physical Review A 53 (1) (1996) 49.

[7] M. O. Scully, K. Drühl, Quantum eraser: A proposed photon correlation experiment concerning observation and" delayed choice" in quantum mechanics, Physical Review A 25 (4) (1982) 2208.

[8] M. O. Scully, B.-G. Englert, H. Walther, Quantum optical tests of complementarity, Nature 351 (1991) 111–116.

[9] S. Dürr, T. Nonn, G. Rempe, Origin of quantum-mechanical complementarity probed by a which-wayexperiment in an atom interferometer, Nature 395 (6697) (1998) 33–37.

[10] S. P. Walborn, M. O. T. Cunha, S. Pádua, C. H. Monken, Quantum erasure: In quantum mechanics, there are two sides to every story, but only one can be seen at a time. experiments show that" erasing" one allows the other to appear, American Scientist 91 (4) (2003) 336–343.

[11] B.-G. Englert, Fringe visibility and which-way information: An inequality, Physical review letters 77 (11) (1996) 2154.

[12] B.-G. Englert, J. A. Bergou, Quantitative quantum erasure, Optics communications 179 (1) (2000) 337–355.

[13] P. J. Coles, J. Kaniewski, S. Wehner, Equivalence of wave–particle duality to entropic uncertainty, Nature communications 5.

[14] W. K. Wootters, W. H. Zurek, Complementarity in the double-slit experiment: Quantum nonseparability and a quantitative statement of bohr's principle, Physical Review D 19 (2) (1979) 473.

[15] P. Mittelstaedt, A. Prieur, R. Schieder, Unsharp particle-wave duality in a photon split-beam experiment, Foundations of Physics 17 (9) (1987) 891–903.

[16] P. J. Lahti, P. Busch, P. Mittelstaedt, Some important classes of quantum measurements and their information gain, Journal of mathematical physics 32 (10) (1991) 2770–2775.

[17] D. Kaszlikowski, L. C. Kwek, M. Żukowski, B.-G. Englert, Information-theoretic approach to single-particle and two-particle interference in multipath interferometers, Physical review letters 91 (3) (2003) 037901.

[18] G. Jaeger, A. Shimony, L. Vaidman, Two interferometric complementarities, Physical Review A 51 (1) (1995) 54.

[19] S. Dürr, Quantitative wave-particle duality in multibeam interferometers, Physical Review A 64 (4) (2001) 042113.

[20] L. B. Levitin, Optimal quantum measurements for two pure and mixed states, in: Quantum Communications and Measurement, Springer, 1995, pp. 439–448.

[21] L.-M. Duan, H. Kimble, Scalable photonic quantum computation through cavity-assisted interactions, Physical review letters 92 (12) (2004) 127902.

[22] A. Reiserer, S. Ritter, G. Rempe, Nondestructive detection of an optical photon, Science 342 (6164) (2013) 1349–1351.